



**Brian Robison**

*Partner*

972-707-1809

brian@brownfoxlaw.com

May 6, 2022

The Honorable Hildy Bowbeer  
Magistrate Judge, District of Minnesota  
United States District Court  
316 N. Robert Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101

Re: Defendants' Date to Answer or Otherwise Respond to the DAPs' Amended Complaints; *In re Pork Antitrust Litig.*, 0:18-cv-01776-JRT-HB

Dear Judge Bowbeer:

I write on behalf of all Defendants in the DAP cases to request confirmation that the Defendants' obligation to answer or otherwise respond to the DAPs' amended complaints is stayed pending the Court's ruling on several open case-management issues.

On April 29-30, 2022, nearly all of the DAPs filed a total of 20 amended complaints. (ECF No. 1278-1317, including both sealed and redacted versions). As the Court is aware, the DAPs and Defendants have submitted proposals for how to manage the DAP cases in the MDL, including their respective positions on whether the DAPs should be required to file a single, consolidated complaint and whether the Defendants should be required to answer or otherwise respond to a consolidated DAP complaint, an exemplar DAP complaint, or all of the new DAP complaints. The Court has not entered a new Case Management Order deciding those issues.

---

The Defendants believe that their obligation to answer or otherwise respond to the DAPs' 20 amended complaints is stayed pending further order of the Court on the case-management issues the parties have briefed and argued. The Defendants conferred with the DAPs on this issue on Wednesday and today. Several DAP groups agreed to this approach once Defendants agreed to give each DAP a list of affirmative defenses asserted in each DAP case no later than May 27, 2022, but other DAPs did not respond with a final position before the Defendants needed to file this letter, given the possible approaching deadline to answer or otherwise respond to the amended complaints.

Given the foregoing, the Defendants respectfully request that the Court confirm that the date to answer or otherwise respond to the DAPs' amended complaints is stayed pending the Court's decision on the open case-management issues. The Defendants also respectfully request that the Court provide such confirmation by May 10, which is three days before the Defendants' responses to some of the DAPs' amended complaints could arguably be due under Rule 15.

Respectfully submitted,



**Brian Robison**